

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/805,156	HASEBE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael J. Simitoski	2134	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Michael J. Simitoski (3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Thomas Jones (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 04 June 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 19, 43 and 45.

Identification of prior art discussed: Cisco.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

  
**KAMBIZ ZAND**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant contacted the Examiner to discuss the amendments to the claims submitted in the latest response. Particularly, Applicant wanted to ensure that the claim amendments highlighted that the user cannot change the settings of the date-and-time management apparatus, as opposed to Cisco. The Examiner suggested a more positive limitation such that it is shown that the device sets a flag "locking" the device to the predetermined manager. The discussion resulted in the language of the Examiner's amendment, such that the Examiner agreed to search that limitation and if found allowable and approved by the primary examiner, to do an Examiner's amendment accordingly.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'mgj', is located below the text block.